

ENCLOSURE B

PROCEDURES RECOMMENDED BY THE IAC STANDING COMMITTEE ON MARCH 29, 1948

1. The original idea or thought for suggested interdepartmental action may originate:
 - a. within CIA, or
 - b. in an IAC agency which will send it to the CIA in a memorandum or letter.
2. If 1a, the ICAPS members will talk it over with their respective departments. If 1b, ICAPS will send a copy to the other IAC agencies and a few days thereafter talk it over at their respective departments.
3. After these conversations at their departments, the ICAPS members will bring back the views of their departments and draw up as a Proposal to the Standing Committee the first paper on the subject in the SANACC form, listing the problem, facts thereon, discussion, conclusions, and recommendations, (which latter would include the proposed NSCID or proposed DCI). The Standing Committee members would reply to this Proposal within ten working days.
4. When replies are received by ICAPS from the Standing Committee members, they will be reconciled if possible. (Note: From my experience here during the past six months, I feel sure that this will be impossible since one agency or another is always changing a sentence or adding or subtracting something to a paper. There is unanimous agreement only on the most innocuous papers.) Since reconciliation will usually be impossible, it is at this time that a Standing Committee meeting will be called to iron out the disagreements and to revise the Proposal into final form. This meeting will be called as soon as possible after the replies are received from all Standing Committee members.
5. The Standing Committee will rewrite the Proposal into a final draft having their approval.

CONFIDENTIAL

6. This final draft will be submitted to the IAC members in duplicate with the voting slip.

Note: All members of the Standing Committee admitted that they would have no real authority delegated from their chiefs and there was no assurance that even though the above procedures were followed that the chiefs would approve this final draft.

It was pointed out that although the working committee had drafted DCI 2/1 on January 19, 1948 and it was circulated on January 21, 1948 after agreement within the ad hoc committee, neither a concurrence nor nonconcurrence has as yet been received from the Navy. The others have long since sent in their approval, but the Navy has been stalling on this paper in spite of at least four verbal requests to speed up its consideration.

Confidential Note: On two occasions it was misrepresented to me that this was on the desk of the Secretary of Defense when actually it was still in ONI and waiting some other decision from the Secretary of Defense before the Navy would consider this matter. (Mr. Blum in Mr. Forrestal's office is now trying to pry it loose.)

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIALSECTION II

1. I pointed out at the meeting that this complicated SANACC procedure seemed to me to be unnecessary for the Standing Committee of the IAC which I thought was appointed as a working committee to write up the papers for the Advisory Committee. This, however, does not seem to be the idea of the Standing Committee.

2. As you will note from Enclosure B, ICAPS is the drafting committee of a formal Proposal which is merely considered, blue penciled, etc. by the various Standing Committee members. This Proposal never gets to the intelligence chiefs, and, even though the Standing Committee members change it, those changes are not necessarily acceptable to the IAC chiefs. The chiefs are not consulted on this Proposal and they do not see the corrections.

3. I recommend, therefore, that CIA go along with the first two steps of Enclosure B and then draw up the formal Proposal for the IAC chiefs rather than for the Standing Committee and that this Proposal is handled as Step III in Enclosure C attached hereto.

4. How the IAC chiefs care to handle such matters within their own departments is, of course, their concern. They can refer the paper (Step IV in Enclosure C) to their "Standing Committee members," or whatever they wish to call their assistants, and can then submit concurrences or nonconcurrences or suggestions for minor changes on their voting slips. That will probably call for meetings of the IAC more often but they do not delegate authority anyway, so I don't see how they can avoid meeting as in the past.

5. You may wish to try again to put across to the IAC agencies that their representatives in ICAPS should in fact be close enough to their own departments to perform good liaison and obtain the viewpoints within their own departments to enable ICAPS as outlined in the first three paragraphs of Enclosure B to prepare a satisfactory paper as outlined therein. The intermediate buffer state of a Standing Committee

would then be unnecessary. Whereas access to the chiefs of the IAC

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

agencies is apparently not readily accorded even within their own shops, I should think this could be arranged if they wished. By ICAPS members hand-carrying more papers and getting the so-called "Standing Committee members" over there to process them after they were in their own departments, our business could be greatly expedited.

6. The ICAPS members feel that to obtain any reasonable success with these proposals it is necessary to have two drafts before the final IAC vote is requested.

CONFIDENTIAL